THE PASSION TO BE CLEAR

losz, the Poet, Tries to Explain Himself...

A distinguished person of my acqaintance, who had years ago shown considerable terest in poetry, on being asked recently if his interest was still active, replied, lo, for the past ten years or more my concern in writing has been concentrated on aking myself clear."

His implication was obvious: poetry is not conducive to clarity. The attempt to poetic somehow clashes with the attempt to be clear. Yet we may wonder if there me not times in the lives of men when the poetic effort becomes necessary to clarity. wever this may be, the desire to be clear is certainly one of the most characteristic- y human desires. When one can no longer keep things separate in one's mind one ses one's way in the world and is incapable of acting like a human being.

In these latter days when much talking is done out of the side of the mouth or in nes which warn the listener not to take what is said seriously, when the same word used on the same page and even in the same sentence in two or more quite different nses, the search for clarity becomes desperate for many of us.

This search is shown perhaps most significantly in the effort of an individual to tain his individuality despite pressures which could extinguish it. To maintain his tonomy in the face of great mass movements which threaten to engulf him it becomes cessary to make clear to himself, and to those he respects, the exact position he cupies in all this swirl of opinion and in the midst of competing forces that never op grabbing for his mind.

It is sometimes sadly embarrassing to watch this effort. For the struggling dividualist in attempting to free himself from entanglement with one of the com- ting forces frequently catapults himself into the vortex of the other.

Take for instance Czeslaw Milosz, until recently Polish cultural attache at ashington, who has broken with the Warsaw government. Milosz is a good poet d a good man. Having come from the upper side of the old feudalism, being, as tells us, of the Lithuanian nobility, and being a Catholic, it is understandable that should find the spiritual climate of the New Poland difficult, even intolerable, tried to serve his country but found it impossible.

Milosz has written an apology for his defection entitled, "The Captive Mind". it he purports to make an honest attempt to show sympathetically 'from the inside' w various independent and more or less creative minds permitted themselves to gradually made captive by the Communist government apparatus until finally they crificed even the illusion of freedom.

We shall look briefly at one of these: Alpha, 'one of the best-known prose iters East of the Elbe,' who after the suicidal Warsaw uprising decided to throw with the Polish Communists, as did Milosz himself.

Alpha and Milosz were working one day on a film scenario in a government fice of the New Poland when they noticed that a neighboring building had been rned into a prison behind whose barred windows they could see young men. These ung men, "it was easy to guess" were soldiers of the Underground Army, loyal the London Government-in-Exile. Alpha was not dismayed. He at once wrote a new novel with the hero a fearless old Communist instead of the priest who had en his hero before the war. For this he received a prize, big royalties, and a lla. In this novel Alpha was more or less true to himself. "Alpha's old hero had erely traded his priest's cassock for the leather jacket of a Communist." The irty dialecticians let him alone for the time being, but after a few years had elaps- they began to 'shorten the reins' on the writers and demanded that they declare emselves clearly for the New Faith and 'socialist realism'.

Alpha decide to go along with this, but it wasn't easy. "He tried to write differ- tly, but whenever he denied something that lay in the very nature of his talent his ose became flat and colorless; he tore up his manuscripts. He asked himself nether he could renounce all effort to portray the tragic conflicts peculiar to life a giant collective."

Then he wrote a self-criticism and joined the Party. "In condemning his previous books he resorted to a special strategem: he admitted openly what he had always secretly thought of the flaws in his work. He didn't need dialectics to show him these flaws; he knew them of old, long before he approached Marxism, but now he attributed his insight to the merits of the Method. Every good writer knows he should not let himself be seduced by high-sounding words or by emotionally effective but empty concepts. Alpha affirmed that he had stumbled into these pitfalls because he wasn't a Marxist." As a result of this and further kowtowing Alpha came to be actively disliked by his fellow-writers.

Milosz here makes a remarkable statement: "It is not my place to judge. I myself travelled the same road of seeming inevitability. In fleeing I trampled on many values that may determine the worth of a man. So I judge myself severely though my sins are not the same as his. Perhaps the difference in our destinies lay in a minute disparity in our reactions when we visited the ruins of Warsaw or gazed out the window at the prisoners. I felt that I could not write of these things unless I wrote the whole truth, not just a part. I had the same feeling about the events that took place in Nazi-occupied Warsaw, namely that every form of literature could be applied to them except fiction. We used to feel strangely ashamed, I remember, whenever Alpha read us his stories in that war-contaminated city. He exploited his subject matter too soon, his composition was too smooth. Thousands of people were dying in torture all about us; to transform their suffering immediately into tragic theatre seemed to us indecent. It is sometimes better to stammer from an excess of emotion than to speak in well-turned phrases. The inner voice that stops us when we might say too much is wise."

What is said here is creditable, but it seems a pity that the same inner voice did not counsel a greater reticence on the part of Milosz himself, or at least a greater dispassionateness. It is true that the poet should be permitted to write what he sees as the whole truth of what happens, and in fact it is just this wholeness that I miss from this poet's prose explanation of his action. Only if the poet is permitted freedom to write as he pleases will the truth appear. And the truth is as greatly needed for their guidance by practical statesmen as by anyone else. Their investigators and their statisticians can never come at this truth. A government which tells its poets what to write is like a man who tells his eyes what to see.

This is not to deny the role of government, but governments must permit themselves to be contradicted, criticized, even condemned by their poets. And this is so even in times of transition, hard as it is at such times on the statesmen who must perform monumental tasks in no time at all. That these men, limited as some of them may be, should be impatient should however also be understandable to a poet as brilliant and warm-hearted as Milosz. My chief quarrel with Milosz in this book is that, while showing how minds are captured under the Zhdanovs of Communism, he fails to show how they are stabled and harnessed under the Luces of Capitalism. Yet the book itself is an involuntary exhibit of this very process. It will become an important item on the fascist menu.

In speaking for the primacy of the poet this man should have spoken the word of a poet. That word would have been sufficient. There was no need to single out dialectics as the enemy. Dialectics, it is true, when placed first in the order of human endeavor may be an enemy. Love, and the act of love, and the singer of love, can have no boss. The Magnificat came before Marx; indeed it has echoes in the Manifesto. To boss the singer is to stifle the song. And the song is what life is. The foundation of all is the simple song. Love cannot be otherwise stated than in song.

Through the experience of his friends and in his own flesh Milosz has known the fear in the East when counter revolutionary forces were being swept from the stage of history. But his imagination is not sufficient to grasp the fear that grips the West and which has driven the West to use its own methods of mass-terror. In Korea, for instance, Milosz could have witnessed such mass terror, but was strangely struck blind in the face of what might otherwise have struck him dumb. He could

ve witnessed the rise of mass-terror in America itself, although here it is vered up, co-ordinated press-wise, and rationalized pulpit-wise, accompanied th grace-notes of pretended repugnance, like this talk of "an agonizing re-praisal of basic policies." It hurts me worse than it hurts you, but I must not are the lash. Agonizing indeed to sacrifice France, the very centre of Western lture. Nevertheless on with the war at all costs. Even a unilateral alliance th the revived Nazis may be necessary, agonizing as it would be, but the war ust go on. Why? Milosz would find one reason why if he should glance at almost y page of financial news, the pulse of our free world. "Present prosperity is derwritten by billions being spent for armaments. It makes one shudder to nk what the sudden outbreak of peace might mean to the American economy." nly increasing arms outlay seems likely to prevent a marked business setback." the international situation had not taken a turn for the worse this spring we uld be inclined to take a serious view of the business outlook."

There are other reasons, closely intermingled with these day to day con-derations, reasons going back to the nature and power of clerical-fascism it-lf, as exemplified in Spain today and in Pilsudski Poland yesterday. The dding of clericalism with naked business power produces this monster and -to-date there has appeared no Saint George in our West to slay it. The best have done is to appease it. Until we have generated the guts and brain to feat it it ill becomes us to condemn the Bolsheviks for their harshness in deal-g with it. Perhaps unintentionally but nonetheless effectively Milosz has put s pen at the service of this thing.

The New Poland, very short-handed and in the face of terrible odds, has rried on a heroic struggle to heal the wounds of a thousand years' war against e workers and peasants by their masters and feudal lords, wounds deepened d lacerated by the onslaught of the Nazis.

What will Milosz think as he hears his book admired and skilfully used by e very Nazis who ground his country beneath their heels and are now the covet-allies of those who fight the Communists? His book, he says, "is a battlefield." st so. He fights against his recent friends. Now let him have a candid look at s new friends.

THE "AGONY" OF DULLES

Roy Grant, magician extraordinary in these parts, once told me that the art prestidigitation (trickery) depended in large part upon diversion, getting the dience interested in what the left hand was doing while the right hand was actually rrying out the deception. This could also have been taken as a lesson in state-aft. It is always a mean and small-minded observer who tries to catch the mag-an, so let us be mean and small-minded.

The magicians have been to Bermuda. Roy Grant happens to be living there w and must have enjoyed their trick, which was to dazzle the eyes of the world th an atomic super-Colombo plan with the left hand while the right hand gets in work at Paris where the European Defence Community is being given a final ot in the arm by U.S. Secretary of State Dulles threatening a basic change in U.S. licy unless France joins the resurrected Nazi leaders in a united front against ssia. Dulles said this change would be "agonizing", though no doubt preferable the alternative of peaceful co-existence, East, West, North and South.

We may well wonder what possible meaning the word "agonizing" can have the architect of the agony of Korea. But that hardly matters. What does matter this: The American Administration is preparing for war and is preparing war. is needs no further documentation than has been given in these pages since the mmer of 1950 when the first bitter fruit of the bi-partisan war policy was gathered the unprovoked attack on China through Formosa and Korea.

Vice-President Nixon returns from official visits to Formosa and Korea, carrying

what assurances to Chiang and to Rhee? Rhee's Ambassador to the United States more than hinted what these assurances would be when, as reported in our last issue by Louis Harding, he telecast on Oct. 19/53 in Philadelphia the news that Rhee has an agreement in black on white with the US Government to the effect that the US will join with South Korea in a renewed attack on North Korea, admitting quite frankly that South Korea had started the war in 1950.

This Eisenhower gesture of co-operation is needed too to divert attention from the activities of the American Administration in Spain, along the whole East-West border as well as within socialist borders, and above all in Western Germany where the Adenauer regime is all too obviously only a curtain-raiser for the real show which is to be full-scale revival of Nazism with the embellishment of atomic weapons, now 'conventional arms' as Eisenhower boasts.

The same sweeping and generous gesture, reviewed with approbation in the British Parliament by Churchill, debasing his great talent to become the puppet of a puppet, was needed on the domestic front where it served two purposes. First, by showing how big we are with the Russians and how small they will be when they spurn our generosity, a motivating background of wounded pride and indignation will have been created for new excursions and alarms by the McCarthyites. Second, the war on America by its industrial princes can proceed without interruption, the raids on labor and on the small farmer, the land and oil and power pillage, and the general debauchery of a 'civilization' geared for war.

Russia could try to fool the crafty ones of the State Department by practising a kind of political judo, going along 'the second mile' with the gesture and thus depriving the West of its exhibition of moral superiority. It is a precarious moment. Everything possible should be done to prevent catastrophe.

Meanwhile the Allies of the United States in the various Anzus and Nato pacts had better re-examine the possible consequences of their alliances.

A SHOCKING BOOK

On the cover of the third edition of the Rev. Charles W. Lowry's "Communism and Christ" is a blurb of praise by Bill Bullitt, the disappointed former Ambassador to Russia, which ought to warn one what to expect in the book itself. But one wonders if this can really be a servant of the Price of Peace who writes in his preface, "The immediate emergency is one not of war, hot or cold, but of peace; and it may well be that it presents this country with the most serious difficulties which it has yet faced."

The book is a fair measure of how far the US has travelled fascist-wards since the days of Wilkie and Roosevelt, neither of whom in this author's opinion had the faintest notion of the nature of Communism. But this cleric knows and tells and in doing so twists history out of all semblance to reality. In the same preface, for instance, he refers to the Russo-German Pact of August, 1939, as the "green light for World War II," the fact being that the green light had been prepared by the Allies of the West before the end of World War I and had been burning steadily from 1917 to 1939. The same green light has been burning from 1945 to this date. And Mr. Lowry's book, a ray of that baleful light, opens with this sinister falsification.

Mr. Lowry claims to have been on to Communism long ago, recognizing Nazism as a kind of 'erstatz Communism.' Obviously he regrets our aid to Russia against Hitler. Echoing the McCarthyites he decries the recent "leftist orientation of American and British policy" and calls all freemen to a realization of the peril in which they stand from the "new dynamic universal this-worldly salvation religion" of Communism.

Later on in the book Mr. Lowry tells us what he thinks religion is. "Religion," he says, "has as its inward motive and form, not mastery but surrender. It is much closer to love than to knowledge....It reveals the human spirit in a passive, receptive role." He adds that there are signs that we are "now in the midst of a great shift

....from reason to faith, from science to religion, from the mastery of self-assertion and self-confidence to the surrender of self in union with super-human being and power." Through all this run false antinomies. Reason is not opposed to faith. Reason is opposed to faith in the irrational. If by reason he means rationalism then rationalism is a faith itself, faith in reason. So with mastery-surrender. Mastery and surrender are twin movements or moods in all creative action, as we have pointed out many times. Either one alone defeats creation. Together they constitute the artist's, the builder's dialectic or paradox: the instantaneous give-and-take of creation.

Religion is love. true enough, but love is not opposed to knowledge; it is the pre-requisite of constructive knowledge, that is, understanding.

Mr. Lowry makes some damaging and damning admissions regarding historic Christianity as contrasted with the Judaism of Jesus which Christianity started out to be but which it stopped being after the first century. Christianity persisted down the ages, he says, "not because of its likenesses to Judaism, but rather because of its affinities with the Mysteries. If these latter had not existed, Christianity would not have become a universal religion and conquered the Roman Empire." (Author's emphasis.) The implication is obvious. Apparently, however, Mr. Lowrie doesn't realize that it was the Roman Empire which conquered Christianity and not the other way about. An important point to be noted is that it is as a "mystery religion of salvation" that Christianity appeals to Mr. Lowrie, and it is to religion in that sense that he sees Communism as a threat. It is, he is right, and it all fits in with our old contention that Communism is re-educating Christianity, bring it down to its roots in the Judaism of Jesus, putting it back on a revolutionary basis where it belongs.

Mr. Lowrie admires the revivalism of Billy Graham whom he hails as a possible new Whitefield. He talks of "an immense spiritual conflagration" to come. We may assume he is right in this also if the war mongers get their way. There is nothing like super camp-meetings to keep the sheep hypnotized while the shepherd sharpens his shears...and knife.

Mr. Lowry, who liked Hitler, has a distressing habit of referring quite unnecessarity to the Jewish faith or Semitic extraction of people he mentions. He speaks of an Ecumenical Conference in Switzerland in 1939 where he met "a little German of Jewish extraction but Lutheran faith" who lived in expectation of war. Mr. Lowry had been in Germany and "had been impressed by the extraordinary prosperity evident on all sides, by the security and confidence enjoyed by most of the people, and by Hitler's interest in the arts, in housing. in public buildings, and in roads." "So I argued," he goes on, "that he (Hitler) wanted peace to preserve and continue his great internal program. My little friend was unimpressed. Yes, he said in his human heart Hitler wants peace. But it will be war. Die Daemonen ihn haben (The demons have got him)."

So have the demons got Lowrie! It would take a dozen issues of this paper to track down the inconsistencies and errors in this book. Mr. Albert Parelhoff, who exposed Professor Jung as a Nazi in these pages, will be interested to know that on p.68 Mr. Lowry claims that there was no place for psychiatry under Hitler, whereas the truth of course is that Professor Jung edited a psychiatric journal for the Nazis.

Much is revealed about this very hate-full book in the author's confession: "For many years the love of God was to me the least meaningful of Christian doctrines. Though I was an ordained minister and an authorized (sic) and respected theologian, I dwelt as little as possible on this doctrine....on the love of God, His goodness and mercy, His fatherly compassion and infinite forgiveness, no! I could not dwell on these withjoy and a sense of personal rapport and meaningfulness."

Then he got converted. "Today I have a very different point of view. I believe that St. John was right when he asserted: 'God is love.'" But one feels that the conversion was in the mind and never touched the heart. This book, for all its pretending to be pious, is written by a man full of unresolved hate for mankind.

ROAD OF REPRESSION

The following communication was sent to the Rochester Times-Union which, in publishing McCarthy's reply to Truman, boasted in loud print of being the first paper in the Nation to print the Jenner report in full. It was ignored. A complaint was registered. It too was ignored. This is freedom of the press.

Editor, Times-Union:

It should not require a Sherlock Holmes to detect the highly colored rendition of the Jenner report on subversive activities in the government in an aspect of partisan political propaganda, despite signatures of three "professing democrats". The effect of the report as to "interlocking subversion in government departments" is to represent the New Deal and the Fair Deal to have constituted a vast communist conspiracy over their twenty years operation, in their attitudes with relation to labor, Russia, China, the Hitler Axis, Yalta, etc., the identifying of communism with the New Deal also helping to generally besmirch progressive and liberal thought and action.

Being highly questionable as to non-partisan validity decided criticism may be entered of unfairness in the blown-up manner of its presentation. Not only publicized at great, serialized length in sensational dress-up, attended by a high-powered advertizing campaign, raising graphic alarm and pictured as a "shocking and almost unbelievable" exposure of national peril, even to peremptorily impel the Press to a free distribution of its storyto the public schools, it is submitted that the newspaper public is entitled to some inkling of respectable and competent questioning of the intrinsic merit of much of the political pretense of this report.

I. F. Stone, a leading Washington liberal journalist, in his "Weekly" publication, has made an impressive analysis of the Jenner report in which he finds highly devious versions of the import of much of its cited testimony. He has dwelt on conspicuous failure of its ostensibly dire disclosures to have procured indictments or convictions or other action to substantiate anything like the wholesale condemnation made of past administrations for laxity of subversive enquiry.

Following are trenchant conclusions of Editor Stone as to fallaciousness of the Jenner report in many serious respects:

"It will be a long time before we can disentangle half-truth and whole lie in the witch-hunt. It will also be a long time before we know the full extent of the sinister forces pumping up the Communist bogey beyond all proportions to serve their own purposes. The New Deal was a kind of Popular Front, in which Communists played their part. There were Communists and Communist Party-liners in Washington, some in important jobs. Their position, their numbers and their influence are being exaggerated beyond all reason. But the liberal press, or what remains of it, is too panic-stricken to discuss the report.

"This popular Front, far from overturning the government by force and violence brought America out of the tail-spin of a great depression, made democracy work, proved that social reform was possible by peaceful means and did so at a time when other countries were turning to dictatorship of right or left. It gave the workers and farmers of America new faith in their country and their society. It taught radicals who came to Washington a new respect for the meaning of free government. The 'security risk' of having a few Communists or Communist sympathizers in the governmentwas far less than the security risk we would have taken if the American people in 1932 had taken the other road — the road of repression and reaction onto which we are being pushed today.

"The purpose of the Jenner report is to defame the memory of a great period in American history; to make Eisenhower a prisoner of the China lobby; and to intensify that mood of paranoid suspicion, mutual distrust and growing panic so necessary as prelude to Fascism."

These observations seem quite pertinent when today gathering symptoms of like emergency are not too remote a prospect for substantial concern.

(Signed) James L. Brewer.

By Louise Harding

ver "Asks to Know": In the November issue of the Iowa Union Farmer (Des ines), F. W. Stover, president of the Iowa Farmers' Union, also the editor, mer Ayres, publicize the Ben C. Limb disclosure of the Oct. 19 radio broadst The daily (sup)press has made every effort to hide what Limb said (under dience questioning); previous attempts by editors and others to get the script led, but IUF has it. The facts are as reported here previously.

ites Mr. Stover:

"The truth will out; Murder will out. The truth about mur- will out. It's official now. This time it comes straight from Syngman Rhee's bassador to the United States Ben C. Limb....

"But why haven't we seen this Limb statement in our papers? Now here is l front-page stuff....Did Dulles make this war commitment to Rhee under eat of public exposure by Rhee of what he promised Rhee in June of 1950?... ll the campaign for a farm program then(upon the renewal of war in January) ain be abandoned as it was in 1950, in order again to support this madman Rhee l to bail out John Foxy Dulles? ....This certainly calls for an investigation. ere is no point of course in asking the Dulles Administration to investigate elf. We are therefore asking the United Nations to investigate this commitnt that Limb claims was made to Rhee."

One would hardly think that even the so-called United Nations, subservient the organization is and always has been to the United States, could venture to estep this demand. If it does the inference will be made exceeding plain many, here and abroad.

e Started the War": The way Limb explained that the attack by the South was lly aggression by the North was to compare the North with a robber who moves o a house and occupies the bedroom and kitchen while leaving the parlor to the seholder. The robber is undoubtedly the aggressor and to throw him out is arly to defend one's home from his aggression. "Well, that's just the reason y your country came in to help us, and they came in to throw out that robber that house, and that is why we started this war..."

Your reporter has traced this parallel to its source in a speech by Warren sten in the UN (Aug. 10, 1950): "A man's house had been attacked by a band of dits, who have occupied most of its rooms and driven him and his family into corner of it. He has called the police who have arrived to help him hold the rner, while reinforcements, which will drive the invading band out of the house, on the way."

The parallel is exact. Rhee's vicious attack on his people as well as this cheap use for it are part of Dulles' great design.

Austin mentioned that the Commission on Korea was composed of represent- ves of Australia, China, El Salvador France, India, the Phillipines and Turkey financial satellites or wishing to be borrowers of the United States). The presentative, so-called,of China (audaciously so termed, for he represented only ritory filched from China and held by force of US arms) was chairman of the mmission when the war started. Austin said that this Commission found on e 26, 1950, that"judging from actual progress of operations" the Northern ime was carrying out well-planned, concerted and full-scale invasion of South rea. These reports,he said, completely disposed of the fantastic charges that aggression was launched by the troops of the Korean Republic.

But a press item from Pusan, Sept. 5, 1950, by Richard J.N. Johnston, pubned in the SF Chronicle, said the Commission on Korea "was in session in san at the time of the invasion." Hence, it saw nothing of the commencement the fighting and knew only that the South Koreans were driven back down the ninsula.

Austin was followed by the cynical British Jebb (Aug. 22,1950):

"We all know here that the foundation of the whole case (for hearing both sides) is a gigantic falsehood.. .Perhaps I should repeat therefore once again that the patent fact of aggression was verified by the United Nations Commission on Korea itself."

And on the same date Austin said:

"One-fourth of a recent speech by the representative of the Soviet Union was devoted to efforts to discredit the objective testimony of the United Nations Commission on Korea. He asserted that the 'composition of the Commission is in no way a guarantee of its objectivity' and referred to 'fabricated reports of the Commission dictated by MacArthur.' This is an insult to the seven nations represented on this Commission.....The representative of the Soviet Union rejects the unanimous judgment of these seven men from these seven countries, based on on the-spot observations, that North Koreans launched an unprovoked attack. If one does not accept the word of the United Nations Commission, whose word can he take?"

Not Austin's, obviously, for he lies in saying the seven were on the spot. They were in Pusan.

What of Public Sentiment?

On getting the report from Iowa Union Farmer with the transcript of Limb's talk, your reporter, at the restaurant, handed it to an 'American Legion' man who has been loud in his support of the Korean war. Here, I said, is something you ought to read. Rhee's man says South Korea started the Korean war. Without reading a word, this individual handed it back and remarked, "Why of course I knew about that!" And very likely, from returning soldiers he had learned something of the fact. But he still thought it all right for the rest of us to be lied to, and plainly he had no objection to what had been done, and felt no shame.

This reminds one of a passage in Professor Namier's "In the Nazi Era", a most interesting work. Eric Kordt, seeing war approaching at the instigation of a madman, had been considering shooting Hitler. However, about the attitude of the German masses, while Hitler was winning, he wrote:

"The journey with Hitler in May 1938 was for me in one respect a shattering experience. ..I saw at close quarters crowds of men and women of all ages at the railway stations pressing towards the carriage. They yelled till their voices broke, and with flushed faces and outstretched arms seemed in the throes of St. Vitus dance....Some women, as it were, flattening their noses against the side of the carriage, held up their children. Hitler would for a moment hold the child's little arms, and shake them somewhat mechanically, without any change of expression... ..The happy mothers would continue to shout Heil....

"A middle-aged Berlin woman often came to my mind, who told me that she went to all manner of demonstrations lining the streets through which the Fuhrer passed, but had never yet properly seen him, for, whenever he approached, her eyes would fill with tears."

Kordt decided not to kill Hitler off. He must have thought, "what's the use?"

The Germans were cheering a victor at least. But what shall be said of US-MacArthur worshippers? After the man had driven to the borders of the Yalu and had been ignominiously forced back, with tremendous suffering and loss to US troops, he returned to these shores, and Adolf himself could not have been greeted with more hysterical enthusiasm. On the part of the ultra wealthy and reactionary that was understandale, for (as he told the joint congressional committee, "Chiang represents our interests." But the mob that tagged at his heels --how did he stand for them? In no wise, except that they were ignorant, stupid, and prejudiced.

Eisenhower Drives to War:

Not long ago your correspondent heard a radio report on Eisenhower addressing a US organization of counter-revolutionists from one of the small Baltic countries, Estonia, if memory serves. He was encouraging them about the prospects of their former land breaking away from present 'enslavement.' What would

the attitude in these USA if the head of the Soviet government should urge at a
blic gathering that Cuba, for instance, break away from its 'enslavement' to
nkee capital? Imagine the warwhoops that would arise. All this sort of stuff
s for its object to get Russia to start a war, as C. D. Jackson, administration
viser and Luce-man, flatly urged. Afew days ago, a column by another would-
war provoker, wealthy Drew Pearson, said this, under the head of

Radio Free Europe Works With Satellite Exiles in U. S.

'One of the most important steps toward the eventual liberation of Iron Curtain
untries, had been quietly started by a little group of exiles in the United States
co-operation with Radio Free Europe.
'Nine committees from the nine satellite countries have been set up to study
ys by which the Iron Curtain areas eventually can become part of Free Europe.
ws that the nine committees have been organized has been broadcast behind the
n Curtain.. ."

ssia, Please Move Over!

Howard K. Smith, who used to be a liberal, in his present-day broadcasts from
ndon almost unfailingly puts forth the tory side. Week before last, discussing
prospects of a conference at which Russia may be represented, Smith said
re was a desire on the part of Britain, France and USA to learn whether Russia
really sincere — would she for instance be willing to make such a concession
to move out of Europe! There spoke the voice of Jacob Kaiser and his kind.
e East German White Book on the Bonn War Treaty (p.40) cites Professor
llstein who is more or less Adenauer's Foreign Minister..... at a press
nference in Washington on March 13th., 1952, stated that the Bonn government
s aiming at the integration of Europe up to the Urals."
The "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung" of March 14th., 1952, made the following
mment: "The Secretary of State named the stages lying ahead: the integration
the Federal Republic in the West, the ending of the partition of Germany, the
on of free Western Europe with an Eastern Europe, liberated from bolshevism
ht up to the Urals."
There was enormous consternation throughout the world and particularly in
rmany over this insolent nazi provocation.....now echoed by Smith!

* * * * * * * * * *

Letter from Shaemas O'Sheel

As one year slips into another, readers of ONE should thank you, as I at least
for the sustenance you continue to give to the courage of all who wish for,
d where possible labor or fight for, an end to political and social obscenities,
d the possible advent of social and political decency. Some of the contents
ONE are outstanding, and it is all very creditable within the framework of
difficulties that beset its publication. Your stout heart beyond doubt is one
the forces framing the future.
Sometimes you commit the editorial fault of failing to identify the source of
me of the news and views you present — to identify them sufficiently, that is.
speaker, citing such news, is helpless, when challenged. I am sure you see the
nt.
Ike's UN speech and the decision to agree to a 4-Power conference may be a
burst of hope; may mean that our masters realize the game is up, and have
led off the cold war. But never believe anything so good until it occurs. Ike's
mic plan seems to me to be only Version 2 of the Baruch Plan; the gist of
h is that the USSR and other socialist countries should yield control of their
mic resources to a UN agency in which the capitalist countries would have
majority of the votes.

Shaemas O'Sheel.

ONE

(Formerly The Protestant)

JANUARY 1954

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard, Jr.
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
David Lord
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Rev. D. McKeen Reid
Leslie Roberts
Raymond Robins
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

ONE is published monthly by New Christian Books, 69 Inglis Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No agents.**

ONE

He hath made of one blood
All Nations

January 1954 Edited by Kenneth Leslie

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

THE ROAD OF REPRESSION

By James L. Brewer

CLARIFYING THE NEWS

By Louise Harding

THE PASSION TO BE CLEAR

By the Editor

Vol. X, No. 3 30 Cents